



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/791,686	03/03/2004	David A. Baer	1875.3970001	2602
26111	7590	02/25/2008	EXAMINER	
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.			HSIA, SHERRIE Y	
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.				
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2622	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/25/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/791,686	BAER ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Sherrie Hsia	2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 34 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4,6-10,12-17,19,20 and 25-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 5,11,18 and 21-24 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 03 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/15/06</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "a digital signal processor (DSP) decoder having an execution unit, an address generator and an instruction set ... updateable" claimed in claim 24, "a reset synchronization system" claimed in claim 30, "an I/O multiplexing system" claimed in claim 31, "an adaptable strapping system" claimed in claim 32, "a multi-channel audio interconnect system" claim in claim 33, "an FM modulation system ... a video data stream front end processor... a packet substitution module... a media processing system ... a 2D adaptive comb filter... an artificial time stamp module... a combined color look-up and gamma correction system ... a timing generator ... a teletext decoder system... a MPAA HDTV copy protection filter system ... signal mode detection system ... a digital signal processor within an audio decoder ... updateable" claimed in claim 34 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet,

even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 34 is objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 34, line5, "us" should be --use--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 2, 19, 25-29, 31 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yeh (7307667).

As to claims 2, 19, 25-29, 31 and 33, Yeh disclose the claimed subject matter, the claimed plurality of input elements are met by the transport & video inputs 495 (Fig. 4), the claimed video and graphics processing elements are met by the video and graphics 498 (Fig. 4), the claimed audio processing elements are met by the APU 496 (Fig. 4), the claimed output interfaces are met by the interfaces 497 (Fig. 4) and the claimed control interfaces are met by interfaces 499 (Fig. 4) and the claimed control element is met by the CPU 414 (Fig. 4) wherein all these functions are coupled through a system controller (CPU 414 (Fig. 4) (see column 1 lines 41-54).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-10, 12-17, 20, 30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeh (7307667).

As to claim 1, Yeh disclose the claimed subject matter, the claimed data transport module is met by the transport 402 (Fig. 4), the claimed digital audio engine is met by the APU 496 (Fig. 4), the claimed analog audio engine is met by the APU 496 (Fig. 4), the claimed digital video engine is met by the video and graphics 498 (Fig. 4) and analog video engine is met by the video and graphics 498 (Fig. 4) wherein all these functions are coupled through a system controller (CPU 414 (Fig. 4) (see column 1 lines 41-54). Yeh does not explicitly show the IF demodulation module. The examiner takes Official Notice that the functionality including an IF demodulation module for processing analog signals is well known and widely used in the television art, and therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Yeh by having the IF demodulation module as part of the circuitry to process the analog signals.

As to claim 3, Yeh does not explicitly show the IF demodulator. The examiner takes Official Notice that the electronic circuitry including an IF demodulator for processing analog signals is well known and widely used in the television art, and therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Yeh by having the IF demodulator as part of the circuitry to process the analog signals.

As to claim 4, Yeh does not explicitly show the digital IF demodulator. The examiner takes Official Notice that the electronic circuitry including an digital IF demodulator for

processing digital signals is well known and widely used in the television art, and therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Yeh by having the digital IF demodulator as part of the circuitry to process the digital signals.

As to claims 6-8, the claimed limitation is disclosed by Yeh (Fig. 4).

As to claim 9, the claimed limitations are disclosed by Yeh (498, Fig. 4).

As to claims 10 and 12, Yeh does not explicitly show the 2D adaptive comb filter. The examiner takes Official Notice that the electronic circuitry including an 2D adaptive comb filter for processing color signals is well known and widely used in the television art, and therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Yeh by having the 2D adaptive comb filter as part of the circuitry to process the color signals.

As to claims 13 and 14, Yeh does not explicitly show the 2D engine and 3D engine. The examiner takes Official Notice that the electronic circuitry including the 2D engine or 3D engine for performing 2D or 3D functions are well known and widely used in the television art, and therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Yeh by having the 2D engine or 3D engine as part of the circuitry to perform 2D or 3D functions.

As to claim 15, Yeh does not explicitly show the color look-up and gamma correction system. The examiner takes Official Notice that the electronic circuitry including color look-up and gamma correction system for processing color signals are well known and widely used in the television art, and therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify the system of Yeh by having the color look-up and gamma correction system as part of the circuitry to process color signals.

As to claim 16, Yeh does not explicitly show the timing generator. The examiner takes Official Notice that the electronic circuitry including the timing generator for generating timing signals is well known and widely used in the television art, and therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Yeh by having the timing generator as part of the circuitry to generate timing signals.

As to claim 17, Yeh does not explicitly show the teletext decoder system. The examiner takes Official Notice that the electronic circuitry including the teletext decoder system for processing text or character signals is well known and widely used in the television art, and therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Yeh by having the teletext decoder system as part of the circuitry to process text or character signals.

As to claim 20, the claimed limitation is disclosed by Yeh (422, Fig. 4).

As to claim 30, Yeh does not explicitly show the reset synchronization system. The examiner takes Official Notice that the electronic circuitry including the reset synchronization system for synchronizing the signals is well known and widely used in the television art, and therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Yeh by having the reset synchronization system as part of the circuitry to synchronize the signals.

As to claim 32, Yeh does not show the adaptable strapping system. The examiner takes Official Notice that the electronic circuitry including the adaptable strapping system for selecting

mode or state is well known and widely used in the television art, and therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Yeh by having the adaptable strapping system as part of the circuitry to select the mode or state.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 5, 11, 18 and 21-24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

7. Claim 34 is allowable over prior art.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

9. Applicant is informed that claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-17, 19, 20, 25-33 can also be rejected by Li (5931934). The examiner did not apply any additional rejection to so as not to be exhaustive and repetitive.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sherrie Hsia whose telephone number is (571) 272-7347.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Ometz can be reached on (571) 272-7593.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (571) 272-1000.



Sherrie Hsia
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2622

SH
February 19, 2008